

### REMARKS

Claims 1-45 are pending in this case, all of which have been rejected. Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-8, 12, 13, 15-22, 26, 27, 29-35, 39, 40, and 42-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,435 (Boebert). Claims 9-11, 23-25, and 36-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boebert. Claims 14, 28, and 41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boebert in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,121,962 (Hwang). Following entry of the amendment, claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 15, 19, 20, 22, 29, 32, 33, and 44 will have been amended, and claims 4, 18, and 31 will have been canceled.

In view of the amendments and the following remarks, applicants submit that the claims are patentable and should be allowed.

#### Claim amendments and section 102/103 rejections

The claims are not identical or similar in either scope, language or substance and should not be construed as if they were identical or similar. However, for the Examiner's convenience in analyzing the claim amendments, applicants note that each of the independent claims has been amended to recite a user NIM ("nexus input mode") indication, that transitions from one execution environment and/or standard input mode to another execution environment and/or nexus input mode.

Paragraphs 0051 through 0055 of the application explain transitions between nexus input mode and standard input mode. In particular, paragraph 0053 describes a mode transition that occurs at the user's request, and explains that – at least in one embodiment – there are plural ways to transition from nexus input mode to standard input mode, but only one way to transition in the other direction. The purpose of this lack of symmetry is that, in one example, a transition to the more secure mode (the nexus mode) should occur purposefully and not accidentally. Thus, in one example, there could be multiple ways of initiating a transition from nexus to standard mode, even though at least one of these multiple ways does not have a symmetrical counterpart for standard-to-nexus transition. And therefore, the user NIM indication has a special status of being a particular and/or exclusive way of initiating a transition from standard to nexus mode. This structure has the advantage

of increasing security by making it less likely that transitions to nexus mode will occur by accident. (See paragraph 0053.)

This feature is not taught or suggested in the applied art. At a minimum, applicants note that the applied art differs from the independent claims in that the applied art does not distinguish between secure/non-secure state changes based on the direction in which the state is changing. By contrast, the claims define different mechanism for state changes depending on whether the state is changing from standard (non-secure) to nexus (secure), or vice versa.

Applicants note that the Examiner appears to acknowledge that the applied art does not treat state transitions differently depending on direction. In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner notes that the applied reference (Boebert) describes changes from standard to trusted input mode, but does not describe the reverse process (which the Examiner considers to be obvious). It is evident from this comment that the Examiner considers state transitions to be the same regardless of which direction the transition occurs. However, as the specification and amended independent claims clarify, there are different mechanisms to perform state transitions depending on which direction the transition occurs, and this lack of symmetry is a feature that increases security.

In view of the amendments and the foregoing remarks, applicants submit that the claims patentably define over the applied art and request reconsideration.

No new matter

The claim amendments do not add new matter.

Claims 1, 15, and 29 have been amended both to incorporate the features of now-canceled dependent claims 4, 18, and 31, respectively, and also to incorporate material that is found at least at paragraph 0053 of the specification. Thus, these amendments do not add new matter.

The amendment to claim 44 is supported at least by paragraph 0053 of the specification, and thus does not add new matter.

Claims 5, 6, 19, 20, 32, and 33 have been amended to adjust their dependencies in view of the incorporation of claims 4, 18, and 31 into their respective dependent claims. Thus, these claim amendments do not add new matter.

Claim 12 has been amended to correct a minor typographical oversight, and the amendment does not add new matter.

Claim 22 has been amended to correct a typographical oversight in its dependency, as suggested by the Examiner, and thus the amendment does not add new matter.

Drawings


The Examiner has not acknowledged acceptance of the formal drawings. Applicants request that in the next Office Action, the Examiner acknowledge that the formal drawings have been accepted.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, applicants submit that this case is in condition for allowance.

Date:

*April 9, 2007*

  
Steven J. Rocca  
Registration No. 30,489

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439